

**On the Double Scaling Limit of  $O(N)$  Vector Models in  $d=2$** Paolo Di Vecchia <sup>‡</sup>*Nordita, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø , Denmark*Moshe Moshe <sup>\*‡</sup>*Department of Physics, Technion - Israel Institute of Technology  
Haifa, 32000 Israel***ABSTRACT**

Recent interest in large  $N$  matrix models in the double scaling limit raised new interest also in  $O(N)$  vector models. The limit  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , correlated with the limit  $g \rightarrow g_c$ , results in an expansion in terms of elementary surfaces and explicit calculations can be carried out also in dimensions  $d \geq 2$ . It is shown here that the absence of physical massless bound states in two dimensions sets strong constraints on this limit.

---

\* *Supported in part by the GIF and the Henri Gutwirth fund*

‡ *e-mail addresses :* divecchia@nbivax.nbi.dk.bitnet

phr74mm@technion.bitnet

Large  $N$  matrix models providing representations of dynamically triangulated random surfaces in their double scaling limit <sup>[1]</sup> have recently raised much interest. Here, the surfaces are represented by the Feynman graphs of the matrix model in the limit, where  $N \rightarrow \infty$  and the coupling constant  $g \rightarrow g_c$  in a correlated manner. An analogous interesting limit is the double scaling limit in  $O(N)$  vector models, which represents filamentary surfaces<sup>[2]–[4]</sup>. These models have many common features with the matrix models and give new insight into the nonperturbative structure associated with the double scaling limit and the related underlying hierarchy<sup>[5]</sup>. In many cases, the  $O(N)$  vector models can be successfully studied<sup>[4]</sup> also in dimensions  $d \geq 2$  and thus gaining intuition for the search of a solution to the long lasting problem of understanding field theories in terms of extended objects<sup>[6]</sup>. The double scaling limit in  $O(N)$  vector quantum field theories reveals an interesting new phase structure, as was argued also in case of matrix models.

Consider the large  $N$  limit of the self interacting scalar  $O(N)$  symmetric vector model in  $d$  Euclidian dimensions defined by the functional integral

$$\begin{aligned} Z_N &= \int \mathcal{D}\vec{\Phi} \exp\left\{-\int d^d x \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \vec{\Phi})^2 + U(\vec{\Phi}^2) \right\} \right\} \\ &= \int \mathcal{D}\vec{\Phi} \int \mathcal{D}\sigma \int \mathcal{D}m^2 \exp\left\{-\int d^d x \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \vec{\Phi})^2 + U(\sigma) - \frac{m^2}{2}(\sigma - \vec{\Phi}^2) \right\} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad [1]$$

$\vec{\Phi}$  is an  $N$ -component real scalar field and the conventional treatment of the large  $N$  limit has been employed in Eq. [1]. The potential

$$U(\sigma) = \frac{\mu_0^2}{2}\sigma + \frac{\lambda_0}{4}\sigma^2 \quad [2]$$

will be discussed below. After integrating out  $\tilde{\vec{\phi}}(x)$  (where  $\vec{\Phi}(x) = \vec{\phi}_c + \tilde{\vec{\phi}}(x)$ ) and  $\sigma(x)$ , the  $m^2(x)$  integration is carried out by a saddle point integration and the effective action  $S_{eff}\{\phi_c\}$  is obtained in the large  $N$

limit.  $L^{-d}S_{eff}\{\phi_c\}$  is proportional to the free energy per unit volume<sup>[7]</sup> at fixed  $\vec{\phi}_c$ . One finds:

$$e^{-S_{eff}\{\phi_c\}} = Ce^{-\frac{NL^d}{2}\left\{\int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \ln(p^2+m^2) - (2N\lambda_0)^{-1}(m^2-\mu_0^2)^2 + m^2\left(\frac{\vec{\phi}_c^2}{N}\right)\right\}} \\ \int \mathcal{D}\alpha(x) e^{-\frac{N}{2}\left\{\int d^d x \alpha(x) \left(\int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{p^2+m^2} - (N\lambda_0)^{-1}(m^2-\mu_0^2) + \left(\frac{\vec{\phi}_c^2}{N}\right)\right)\right\}} \quad [3] \\ e^{\frac{N}{4}\left\{\int dx dy \alpha(x)\alpha(y) \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} e^{ip(x-y)} \left(\Sigma(p) + \frac{1}{N\lambda_0}\right) + O(\alpha^3)\right\}}$$

where  $m^2(x) = m^2 + \alpha(x)$  and  $m^2 = m^2(\vec{\phi}_c^2)$  is the solution of the gap equation-saddle point condition:

$$m^2 = \mu_0^2 + \lambda_0 \left\{ N \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \left\{ \frac{1}{k^2 + m^2} \right\} + \vec{\phi}_c^2 \right\} \quad [4]$$

The double scaling limit<sup>[2]-[4]</sup> is reached in the limit at which  $N \rightarrow \infty$  is correlated with the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow \lambda_c$ , where  $\lambda_c$  is the value of the coupling constant at which the  $O(\alpha^2)$  term at  $p=0$  in Eq.[3] vanishes. Namely,

$$\Sigma(p=0) + \frac{1}{N\lambda_0} = 0 \quad [5]$$

where

$$\Sigma(p) = \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{[(k-p)^2 + m^2][k^2 + m^2]}$$

In physical terms, the double scaling limit is reached when the self coupling  $\lambda_0$  of  $\vec{\Phi}$  reaches the value  $\lambda_c$  at which the strength of the force between the quanta of the  $\vec{\Phi}$  fields, the fundamental scalars in the theory, binds them together strongly enough to create a **massless** scalar,  $O(N)$ singlet,  $\vec{\Phi} \cdot \vec{\Phi}$  bound state.

Following the above procedure, it has been shown in Ref.[8] that in  $d=4$  the effective potential is complex and the critical vector model cannot be consistently defined. This property is closely related to the triviality of  $\lambda\vec{\Phi}^4$  in  $d=4$  in the large  $N$  limit<sup>[10]</sup>. It is shown below that also in  $d=2$  a similar problem occurs and is associated with the absence of massless bound states in two dimensions.

The divergences in Eq. [3] can be treated<sup>[8]–[10]</sup> in a conventional renormalization scheme in the large  $N$  expansion and the discussion in the last paragraph can be restated in terms of renormalized physical parameters. In  $d=2$ , the gap equation, Eq.[4], is thus given in terms of the renormalized parameters by:

$$m^2 - \frac{\lambda N}{4\pi} \ln\left(\frac{M^2}{m^2}\right) = \mu^2 + \lambda \vec{\phi}_c^2 \quad [6]$$

where

$$\mu^2 = \mu_0^2 + \frac{N\lambda}{4\pi} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{M^2}\right) \quad [7]$$

and there is no renormalization of the coupling constant  $\lambda_0 = \lambda$ . (A momentum U.V. cutoff has been used in Eqs. [4] and [7].) Since  $\Sigma(0) = (4\pi m^2)^{-1}$ , the criticality condition in Eq. [5] implies here :

$$\lambda_c = -\frac{4\pi m^2}{N} \quad [8]$$

which agrees with Eq. [3.23] in the second paper of Ref. [4] (note:  $f = \frac{N\lambda}{4}$ ).

The minimum of the effective action can be read directly from Eq.[3], namely (see also Refs. [8]-[9])

$$m^2 \vec{\phi}_c = 0 \quad . \quad [9]$$

It sets to zero the expectation value of the  $\vec{\Phi}$  field in the  $O(N)$  symmetric phase, where  $m^2 \neq 0$  is the physical mass of the  $\vec{\Phi}$  scalars. The condition in Eq. [5] has to be satisfied, of course, at the minimum of the effective potential, namely, at the values of  $m^2 \neq 0$  and  $\vec{\phi}_c = 0$  for which Eqs. [6] and [9] are satisfied. The value of  $m^2 = m^2(\vec{\phi}_c^2 = 0)$  in Eq.[8] is thus the solution of the gap equation (Eq. [6]) at  $\vec{\phi}_c^2 = 0$ , namely, at the minimum of the effective action. In terms of the renormalized parameters and  $\lambda = \lambda_c$  the gap equation is given (at  $\vec{\phi}_c^2 = 0$ ) by:

$$m^2 \ln\left(\frac{M^2 e}{m^2}\right) = \mu^2 \quad [10]$$

The effective action in Eq. [3] in the double scaling limit ( $N \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_c$ ) is finally obtained by inserting there the solution of the gap equation  $m^2(\phi_c)$  found from Eq.[6]. In terms of the renormalized parameters, Eq.[4] is given (at  $\lambda = \lambda_c$  and  $\mu^2$  from Eq.[10]) by:

$$m^2(\vec{\phi}_c^2) + m^2 \ln\left(\frac{m^2}{m^2(\vec{\phi}_c^2)_e}\right) = -\frac{4\pi m^2}{N} \vec{\phi}_c^2 \quad [11]$$

The right hand side of Eq.[11] has a minimum at  $m^2(\vec{\phi}_c^2) = m^2$ , where it vanishes and thus there is no real solution for  $m^2(\vec{\phi}_c^2)$  at any real  $\vec{\phi}_c^2 \neq 0$ . Thus, the criticality condition in Eq.[5] which implies a zero mass  $\vec{\Phi} \cdot \vec{\Phi}$  bound state cannot be consistently defined. The nonexistence of a real effective action in the double scaling limit in d=2 is a reflection of the absence of a zero mass bound state in two dimensions. The absence of a consistent picture of the double scaling limit in d=2 as a result of the vacuum fluctuations can be clearly seen also in the self interacting spinor O(N) symmetric theory defined by<sup>[11]</sup>:

$$Z_N = \int \mathcal{D}\vec{\psi} \mathcal{D}\vec{\bar{\psi}} \mathcal{D}\sigma e^{-\int d^d x [\vec{\bar{\psi}}(i\vec{\partial} + g_0\sigma)\vec{\psi} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2]} \quad [12]$$

After integrating out  $\vec{\psi}$  and  $\vec{\bar{\psi}}$ , the saddle point integration on  $\alpha(x) = \sigma(x) - \sigma_c$  results in a gap equation:

$$\sigma_c - N \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} Tr\left(\frac{g_0}{\not{k} + g_0\sigma_c}\right) = 0 \quad [13]$$

and a criticality condition (setting the  $O(\alpha(x)^2)$  term in the functional integral to zero)

$$1 + g_0^2 N \Sigma(p=0) = 0 \quad [14]$$

where

$$\Sigma(p) = \int \frac{d^2 k}{(2\pi)^2} Tr\left\{\frac{1}{(\not{k} - \not{p} + g_0\sigma_c)(\not{k} + g_0\sigma_c)}\right\} \quad [15]$$

As in the scalar case, Eq.[14] is proportional to the four point function of the fundamental field, and the criticality condition amounts to imposing

the existence of a massless  $\vec{\psi} \cdot \vec{\psi}$  bound state in the spectrum. No such pole exists in d=2, Eq.[14] is never satisfied. One finds:

$$1 + g_0^2 N \Sigma(p) = 1 - g_0^2 \frac{N}{2\pi} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{m^2}\right) - g_0^2 \frac{N}{2\pi} \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m^2}{p^2}} \ln\left(\frac{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4m^2}{p^2}} - 1}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{4m^2}{p^2}} + 1}\right) \quad [16]$$

Since  $1 - g_0^2 \frac{N}{2\pi} \ln\left(\frac{\Lambda^2}{m^2}\right) = 0$  as a result of Eq.[13], the right hand side of Eq.[16] does not vanish at  $p = 0$  and thus Eq.[14] cannot be satisfied.

Yet, another two dimensional model for which the criticality condition cannot be satisfied is the nonlinear sigma model, where the equivalent of Eq.[14] reads simply  $\Sigma(p = 0) = 0$  and is clearly impossible to satisfy.

In conclusion, the emerging physical picture for the double scaling limit is very clear. In this limit, the force between the fundamental quanta is set to the value at which the mass of their bound state vanishes. In d=2 dimensions, vacuum fluctuations avoid reaching this limit. In the scalar theory the instability of this limit is manifested by the absence of a real solution to the relevant equations, namely, the absence of a real effective action. In the case of asymptotically free theories the double scaling critical condition is not satisfied for any value of the coupling constant. Thus, a formal analytic continuation is required in order to give a physical meaning to the double scaling limit in d=2 dimensions. In d=3 some of these problems are absent and in certain cases the massless bound state is associated with the dilaton pole<sup>[12]</sup>.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

M.M. thanks NORDITA for the hospitality during a visit last summer and thanks J. Feinberg for several useful discussions.

## References

1. E. Brézin and V.A. Kazakov , Phys. Lett. **236B** 144 (1990)  
M.R. Douglas and S.H. Shenker, Nucl. Phys. **B335** 635 (1990)  
D.J. Gross and A.A. Migdal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** 127 (1990) ; Nucl.  
Phys. **B340** 333 (1990)
2. J. Ambjorn, B.Durhuus and T. Jónsson , Phys. Lett. **244B** 403 (1990)
3. S. Nishigaki and T. Yoneya , Nucl. Phys. **B348** 787 (1991)  
A.Anderson, R.C. Myers and V. Periwal, Phys. Lett. **254B** 89 (1991)  
Nucl. Phys. **B360** 463 (1991).  
P. Di Vecchia, M. Kato and N. Ohta, Nucl. Phys. **B357** 495 (1991).
4. J. Zinn-Justin, Phys. Lett. **257B** 335 (1991)  
P. Di Vecchia, M. Kato and N. Ohta, Int. Journal of Mod. Phys. **7A**  
1391 (1992).
5. P.H. Damgaard and K. Shigemoto Nucl. Phys. **B262** 432 (1991) and  
references therein.
6. H. Neuberger, Nucl. Phys. **B340** 703 (1990) and private communica-  
tions.
7. See e.g. E. Brézin and J. Zinn-Justin Nucl. Phys. **B257** 867 (1985)  
and aslo Refs. [8]-[10].
8. H. J. Schnitzer Concerning the Double Scaling Limit in the  $O(N)$  Vector  
Model in Four Dimensions - Brandeis preprint BRX-TH-333 (1992)  
See also Ref. [9]
9. L. F. Abbott, J. S. Kang and H. J. Schnitzer, Phys. Rev. **D13** 2212  
(1976) and references therein.
10. W.A. Bardeen and M. Moshe, Phys. Rev. **D28** 1372 (1983)  
and Phys. Rev. **D34** 1229 (1986). See also Ref. [9]
11. D. J. Gross and A. Neveu Phys. Rev. **D10** 3235 (1974)
12. M. Moshe - Proceedings of Renormalization Group '91 Conference,  
Dubna, Sept. 1991, Ed. D. V. Shirkov, World Scientific Pub. 1992.